

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# PCT

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>PHUS030450WO</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b>	See item 4 below
International application No. <b>PCT/IB2004/052391</b>	International filing date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) <b>11 November 2004 (11.11.2004)</b>	Priority date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) <b>13 November 2003 (13.11.2003)</b>
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant <b>KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.</b>		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.																								
In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																									
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 20%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 70%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report <b>15 May 2006 (15.05.2006)</b>
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">Cecile Chatel</div> Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 04 FEB 2005

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WIPO PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/IB2004/052391

International filing date (day/month/year)  
11.11.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
13.11.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
H04L12/28

Applicant  
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.

### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Mircescu, A

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7645



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2004/052391

---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IB2004/052391

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-29
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-29
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-29
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

---

**Box No. VI Certain documents cited**

---

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.10)

and / or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-0 707 265 (IBM) 17 April 1996 (1996-04-17)

D2: US 2002/059425 A1 (CAPPS STEVE ET AL) 16 May 2002 (2002-05-16)

**A. Citations and explanations with respect to Item V**

1. Document D1 discloses according to all features of claim 1 a method for a consistent user interface (CUI) on a control device (see D1, page 5, lines 21-25) providing access to at least one network device having a remote user interface (RUI) (see D1, page 5, lines 33-36), comprising the steps of:
  - providing the CUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-25);
  - mapping the RUI to the CUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36); and
  - displaying by the control device at least a part of the CUI instead of the RUI as a user interface to the network device (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36).

Therefore the subject matter of claim 1 is not new (Art 33(2) PCT).

2. The subject matter of claim 21 differs from that of claim 1 by the feature "a slave network device to replace a remote user interface RUI with a consistent user interface CUI". Since this feature is also disclosed in D1, page 5, lines 21-36 the subject matter of claim 21 is also not new (Art 33(2) PCT).
3. Document D1 discloses according to all features of claim 22 a control device that provides at least one slave device having a remote user interface RUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36), comprising:
  - a transceiver for receiving the RUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36: This feature is implicit, since a transceiver is necessary in order to obtain the RUI information);
  - an extraction logic module configured to extract at least one component of the RUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36: This feature is implicit, since the extraction module is necessary in order to perform the mapping described below);
  - a database that is configured to store synonyms of components of an RUI (see D1, page 4, lines 10-20); and an analysis and transformation module configured to
    - i. map the extracted at least one component of the RUI to a component of

the CUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36) according at least one of the synonyms stored in the database and a thesauri (see D1, page 4, lines 10-20);

ii. store the mapping in a memory (see D1, page 4 lines 10-20; page 5, lines 21-36);

iii. optionally update the synonym data base with the mapping (see D1, page 4, lines 10-20), and

iv. provide a user interface to the at least one slave device according to at least a part of the mapping of the extracted at least one component of the RUI (see D1, page 5, lines 21-36).

Therefore the subject matter of claim 22 is not new (Art 33(2) PCT).

4. Dependent claims 2-20 and 23-29 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, are novel for the reason that the subject matter of said claims is disclosed in document D1 (see in particular figures 5, 7, and 8; page 2, lines 30-34 and 52-54; page 3, lines 1-7; page 4, lines 10-20; page 5, lines 17-36; page 6, lines 45-56).

The subject matter of dependent claims 2-20 and 23-29 therefore is not new, Art 33(2) PCT.

**B. Further remarks made in respect of the present application**

1. Although claims 1 and 21 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject matter and to differ from each other only in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Art 6 PCT.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to the following matters, which should as well be considered:
  - 2.1 To meet the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in documents D1 and D2 should be acknowledged in the description.
  - 2.2 The opening part of the description should be brought into conformity with the

wording of any new or amended independent claim, Rule 5.1(a)(iii) PCT.

- 2.3 To meet the requirements of Rule 6.3(b) PCT, any independent claim should be correctly cast in the two-part form, with those features which in combination are part of the nearest prior art being placed in the preamble.
- 2.4 Reference signs in parentheses should be inserted in all claims to increase their intelligibility, Rule 6.2(b) PCT. This applies both to the preamble and to the characterizing portion.
3. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that the application may not be amended in such a way that it contains subject matter which extends beyond the content of the application as filed, Art 34(2)(b) PCT.

In his letter of reply, the applicant should indicate the parts of the originally filed application serving as a basis for subject matter newly introduced into the claims.

4. The applicant is requested to file amendments by way of replacement pages in accordance with Rule 66.8 PCT.